



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

for the privilege of swinging in behind the band. The parades look like a unanimous vote that some one else should "prepare."

Yet it is hard to blame them. Marching is more fun than working at the usual job, especially when the pay goes on just the same. If it were only and simply a parade, no complaint could be made. But as they are advocating something affecting all of us intimately, now and for many years to come, we are all very much concerned.

The acid test of an honest preparedness enthusiasm, if the paraders be grimly certain that our country is really in peril, must be an eagerness to enlist in the army or navy or to offer their services directly to the nation. The patriotism behind the preparedness parade is mainly that of bands, flags, and conviviality, as artificial as it is ineffective.

One wonders what would be the effect if a few banners like the following were to be carried by the marchers? Such banners are truthful, poignant, and appropriate to any sincere demonstration in favor of real preparedness. They embody facts. Let us examine them:

"Nobody seriously supposes that the United States needs fear an invasion of its own territory."—WOODROW WILSON, January 27, 1916.

"This country is not threatened from any quarter. She stands in friendly relations with all the world."—WOODROW WILSON, January 27, 1916.

"There exists today no more efficient institution than the United States Navy."—JOSEPHUS DANIELS, 1916.

"We must abolish pork-barrel methods in the army as regards army posts, navy yards, as regards everything else."—THEODORE ROOSEVELT, May 19, 1916.

"We have the best coast defenses in the world."—General E. N. WEAVER, Chief of the Seacoast Artillery Corps, January 19, 1916.

"No European army will ever be placed on American soil."—General NELSON A. MILES, 1916.

"Our navy is more efficient today than ever before."—Admiral VICTOR BLUE, February 4, 1916.

"Cultivate peace and harmony. . . . Overgrown military establishments are, under any form of government, inauspicious to liberty, and are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty."—GEORGE WASHINGTON.

In the midst of peace they prepared for war—England, Germany, France, Austria, and the rest—THEY GOT IT.

Edyth Cavell said: "Standing before God and eternity, I realize that patriotism is not enough. I must be free from hate and bitterness."

THE FEARS OF THE PACIFISTS:

Not Wars, but WRONGS.
Not Injury, but INJUSTICE.
Not Blood, but BARBARISM.
Not Death, but HATREDS.

MILITARY PREPAREDNESS carries the GERMS OF WAR—
SWAT THAT FLY!

We are for ADEQUATE DEFENSE.
What is "adequate defense"?

A SMALL PART of the present ARMY BILL provides for a national guard of nearly half a million men—

Each with A GUN.
Each with PUBLIC FUNDS.
Each with RIGHTS OVER CIVILIANS.
Each with THE VOTE.
NEXT?

MILITARY PREPAREDNESS is an infectious DISEASE. It LEADS to the greatest of all diseases—WAR.

WITNESS EUROPE!

Give us the greatest fortress in the world—
an INTERNATIONAL LEGISLATURE.
Give us the greatest of all dreadnaughts—
an INTERNATIONAL COURT.

There have been no such banners in any of the parades. Newspapers are wholly unwilling to display such sentiments. One wonders why.

LET US MOBILIZE FOR PEACE!

If we would reverse the ancient unwisdom and follow the mandate of wisdom, let us, in time of war, mobilize for peace. In another part of this issue appears an "appeal" from Senator La Fontaine, of Belgium, for "A United Pacifism." For all patriotic pacifists it is, in effect, a call to arms. It is a concrete outline of a few of the tasks that are sure to confront the peace organizations of the world in the immediate future, when peace shall be declared.

Action is needed. Preparedness is in the air. It is continuously, persistently there. If pacifists will only rise to their opportunity and see their problem whole, they can bend even the preparedness enthusiasm to their own great ends. Peace will be declared and new agreements drawn by the nations now engaged in snarling and biting at each other's throats. But a universal peace will not be declared, a lasting or even promising affiliation of nations cannot be effected, by a pure miracle. No *deus ex machina* will descend to give a happy ending to this unprecedented carnage. No "good intentions" nor "international point of view" will defeat forever the repetition of this wholesale massacre. Action, concerted action, persistent, untiring, sustained, intelligent action on the part of every pacifist in the world is the one solution of that problem. And early action!

We favor heeding this "appeal" for concentration and co-operation. Thus only can the miracle be performed; and we may attain the greater miracle only by the performance of the lesser miracle—union among ourselves. We are all striving for world peace—whether our standard be raised for enforced peace or unenforced peace, military preparedness or some form of co-operative dis-

armament. It is wisdom that we strive together! This war is no proof that the program for world peace has failed—quite the contrary; but were the armistice in Europe to come upon us and find us still unmobilized,

unprepared to enter at once upon the field of our one great opportunity—then might the peace movement be regarded in this country and in all the world as perilously close to a failure, both abject and disgraceful.

NEUTRALS AND INTERNATIONAL LAW IN WARTIME

DR. EUGENE WAMBAUGH is professor of law at Harvard University. Asked to deal with the possibilities of establishing international co-operation in wartime for the purpose of adapting international law to changing conditions and specific emergencies, and to deal with this matter especially from the point of view of the rights and duties of neutrals, he pointed out, at the recent Mohonk Conference, the following twelve articles as the bases for an international agreement:

ARTICLE 1.

In time of war, the rights and duties of neutral governments and of neutral individuals toward belligerent governments and belligerent individuals shall remain as in time of peace, unless the contrary can be shown clearly by treaties, conventions, or otherwise.

ARTICLE 2.

When the words neutral and belligerent are used in this convention or in agreements amendatory hereof, the words shall be understood as including both government and individual, unless this construction shall tend to increase the duties of neutrals or the rights of belligerents, and unless a contrary construction shall be clearly indicated.

ARTICLE 3.

There shall be established three permanent international commissions to care for emergencies arising in case of war, namely, a legislative commission, an executive commission, and a judicial commission.

ARTICLE 4.

The legislative commission shall consist of two members from each of the signatory powers; and in case of war it may, by majority vote of the commissioners voting, establish for the period of the war rules of international law not in conflict with this convention and not in conflict with agreements forbidding change.

ARTICLE 5.

The executive commission shall consist of one member from each of the signatory powers; and in case of war it may investigate and report upon any apparent infraction of international law, in such investigation receiving the aid of all signatory powers.

ARTICLE 6.

The judicial commission shall consist of one member from each of the signatory powers; and in case of war, it may decide, both during the war and afterwards, unless otherwise hereby expressly agreed, all disputes raising questions of international law, and its decisions will be recognized and obeyed by all signatory powers.

ARTICLE 7.

Each of the three commissions shall have a president, and shall meet at his call; and each of them shall have a standing subcommittee, to deal with matters needing instant action or not needing the presence of the entire commission.

ARTICLE 8.

No person shall be a member of more than one commission at any one time.

ARTICLE 9.

A representative of a belligerent power may vote as a member of the legislative commission or of the executive commission, but may not serve as a member of any subcommittee and may not vote as a member of the judicial commission.

ARTICLE 10.

The appointment of members of the commissions shall not await war, but shall take place as soon as this convention has been ratified by three powers.

ARTICLE 11.

In case any neutral government shall consider that any belligerent government has disregarded unjustifiably the general rules of international law or the proceedings of the commissions herein provided, the neutral government, whether itself injured or not, may, until the belligerent government shall obtain from the proper commission a finding that the neutral government is in error, take one or all of the following steps regarding the belligerent, namely, (1) to prohibit belligerent warships not in distress to enter its harbors or to approach within a marine league of its shores; (2) to prohibit belligerent merchant vessels not in distress to enter its harbors; (3) to prohibit contraband of war to be shipped to the belligerent governments or to persons residing in its boundaries; (4) to prohibit commercial intercourse of any sort between residents of the two countries; (5) to prohibit within its borders subscriptions to the loans of the belligerent government, and (6) to prohibit its citizens to serve in the belligerents' forces.

ARTICLE 12.

It shall not be considered a breach of neutrality for a neutral government provided it acts identically toward all parties to the war, to take as to each belligerent government any or all of the steps detailed in the immediately preceding article.

Recent international history has clearly demonstrated the need for a decision by the great powers upon the question whether or not international law can be changed during the time of war. The United States Government, by proposing at the outset of the war that the nations observe the provisions of the Declaration of London, which is an unratified code of rules regarding naval warfare, definitely placed itself upon record in favor of the principle that international law can be either established or amended in time of war. But in its attitude toward the sale of armaments by manufacturers within the United States, it has expressed the view that international law cannot be changed during war time. Here is a disputed point evidently, which should be definitely settled.

Again, belligerents have repeatedly complained to neutrals that other belligerents have broken international laws. The complaints indicated that the neutrals were expected to do something in the premises. No provision is made whereby the neutrals can act in such cases.